

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, and 15-20 are amended; claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 are amended for clarity and claim 17-20 are amended to recite practical use.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Paul Tsou, during the April 19, 2006, telephone interview. The substance of the telephone interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

The Office Action rejects claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 17-20 are amended to obviate this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Pearce et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,211,882). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Pearce discloses all the subject matter recited in claims 1-20 relying on the following portions of Pearce:

C1/L56 - C2 and C7;

C3/L1, 2, 12 and 24-33;

C3/L65 - C4/L4;

C4/L29-49; and

Figs. 1 and 11.

Pearce was directed to simulation of motion blur in computer generated imagery. (See C1/L11-12.) Pearce disclosed tessellating an object into polygons and then displaying the object movement between S_{open} and S_{closed} positions to simulate real-world motion blur. (See C3/L24-26 and 46-48.) To do this, Pearce taught a "super sampling process" where multiple sampling points of the moving object may be obtained between the position of the object at S_{open} and S_{closed} . See C3/L55 - C4/L4. Thus, Pearce taught to simulate real-world blurring by

capturing sample points of the object between two positions of the object. That is, Pearce captured portions of the moving objects at intermediate points between two positions to "simulate" blurring. Pearce did not disclose or suggest a plurality of effect objects (i.e., effect objects are not the object) at a front side in the moving direction from a location of the first object, as recited in claims 1, 8, 15 and 16.

In view of the above, Pearce did not disclose or suggest all the subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 16. Claims 2-7, 13, 17 and 19 depend from claim 1, claims 9-12, 14, 18 and 20 depend from claim 8. Thus, Pearce did not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1-20. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Paul Tsou
Registration No. 37,956

WPB:PXT/tbh

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 15, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--